NASA News

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Washington, D.C. 20546
AC 202 755-8370

For Release:

UPON RELEASE OF
PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
MESSAGE, NOON, EST
FEBRUARY 8, 1982

NASA BUDGET PRESS CONFERENCE

STATEMENT OF JAMES M. BEGGS

ADMINISTRATOR

FEBRUARY 6, 1982

HOLD FOR RELEASE AT NOON, EST, FEBRUARY 8, 1982

NOTE: This statement relates to the Fiscal Year 1983 Budget and is subject to the same conditions. There should be no premature release of this statement nor should any of its contents be paraphrased or alluded to in earlier stories. There is a total embargo on the Budget until Noon, EST, Feb. 8, 1982, which includes any and all references to any material in the Budget Appendix, or supporting statements.

I welcome this opportunity to comment on President Reagan's proposed budget for NASA for Fiscal Year 1983.

This budget was prepared in the light of the President's two major policy priorities: reviving the economy and strengthening the national security. Inherent in those priorities are the principles of fiscal restraint and greater attention to NASA activities with national security implications.

Given the tightly constrained fiscal environment in which this budget was prepared, I believe we did well. This budget represents the Administration's commitment to the evolution of the Space Shuttle into an operational system. It also provides for continuing progress in major NASA program areas.

The President is requesting just over $6.6 billion for NASA for FY 1983. This represents an overall increase of $673 million, or 11 percent, over the revised plan for FY 1982. Factoring in inflation, we will have a slight increase in purchasing power throughout this fiscal year.

The $5.3 billion requested for research and development constitutes 81 percent, or the lion's share of the total request. More than half of this request, or $3.5 billion, is for Space Transportation, which includes not only the Shuttle, and its related systems -- Spacelab and upper stages -- but also our stable of expendable launch vehicles -- the Scout, Centaur and Delta -- as well.

The $3.5 billion would be divided about evenly between Shuttle production, system upgrading and performance augmentation on the one hand and Shuttle operations on the other. This is in contrast to previous years when funds for the latter lagged significantly below the former. The budget request reflects rapid movement into the operational phase, which we expect to begin in early Fiscal 1983 with the first operational flight.

The Shuttle's two orbital test flights were highly successful and proved that the concept of this extremely sophisticated, versatile and reusable space vehicle is technically sound. This budget is consistent with our immediate goal: to make the Shuttle the work horse of our civil and military efforts in space through the 1980s. The budget will support:

- A schedule of five planned launches including the first operational mission in FY 1983; 10 launches in FY 1984; and 13 launches in FY 1985;

- Continued progress in production of the third and fourth Shuttle orbiters, 103 and 104: (the second orbiter, 099, is scheduled for delivery during FY 1982);

- Provision of upper stages for planetary, geosynchronous and other special missions;

- Launch of the first Spacelab mission and continued procurement of the second Spacelab flight unit;

- Performance augmentation to reduce the weight of the solid rocket boosters and enhance the Shuttle's ascent performance for future NASA and national security missions;

- Preparation for a demonstration of the Shuttle's capability to retrieve an operational spacecraft -- the Solar Maximum Satellite -- for repair in orbit or return to Earth for refurbishment;

- The test, checkout and initial operation of the new Data Relay Satellite System (TDRSS).

In addition to increased emphasis on the Shuttle's operational capability, the FY 1983 budget will continue to support progress in aeronautical research and technology and in other vital areas of the space program.

Though some reductions have been made in the area of aeronautical research and technology, the FY 1983 request of $232 million will provide for technology advances in all aeronautical disciplines, stressing those which have been judged most vital in maintaining U.S. leadership in civil and military aviation. The budget preserves a strong research and technology base in aerodynamics, propulsion, materials and structures, aircraft controls and guidance, and human factors. It also maintains the experimental facilities and skilled personnel dedicated to this goal at the NASA research centers.

With Congressional approval, this budget will also support vital ongoing NASA programs. It proposes:

- $682 million for space science programs, emphasizing Spacelab missions; continued flight operations support anticipating Voyager's encounter with Uranus in 1986; developmental work on the Space Telescope, to be launched in 1985; on the Gamma Ray Observatory, to be launched in 1988; on the Galileo Jupiter Probe, to be launched in 1985; on the support systems and science instruments of the International Solar Polar Mission, a joing NASA-European Space Agency program; and on the physics and astronomy explorers and suborbital activities.

- $320 million for important work in space applications missions, including the analysis of early data from Landsat-D's Thematic Mapper, a new generation Earth-scanning instrument which greatly improves our capability to study global resources; continued payload development projects for Spacelab, including materials processing; and analysis of early results from the International Search and Rescue Experiment, which will provide faster and more accurate data by satellite for locating aircraft or ships in distress.

The FY 1983 budget request also provides for continuing studies, investigations and definitions of mission options and advanced programs that will soon be possible because of the Shuttle's operational capability and flexibility. Possibilities under study include unmanned platforms in both low Earth orbit and geosynchronous orbit; a permanently manned facility, or space station, in low Earth orbit; and various elements of orbital test and transportation for their support.

I have given you brief highlights of our proposed budget for FY 1983. Like every other government agency we have had to reduce or delay some programs because of the urgent need to cut the rate of increase in Federal spending. But because of the importance to the nation of NASA's work and its spinoffs, we have come off well. And though there are no new starts, we are continuing with most of our ongoing activity in what we consider to be a balanced way.

Looking to the future, I am confident we will make the most of the opportunities the Shuttle affords as we open a magnificent new era of transportation, commerce and industrialization in space.

# # # # #

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

- - -

FY 1983 BUDGET

PRESS BRIEFING

WITH

JAMES M. BEGGS

ADMINISTRATOR

- - -

ROOM 6104
400 MARYLAND AVENUE, S.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

- - -

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1982

- - -

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. BEGGS: Good afternoon. It is my pleasure to comment on the President's proposed budget for NASA for fiscal 1983.

First, a couple of points on the philosophy of the budget. The budget was prepared in light of the President's two major policy priorities -- reviving the economy and strengthening the national security.

Inherent in those priorities are the principles of fiscal restraint and greater attention to NASA activities with national security implications.

Given the tightly constrained fiscal environment in which this budget was prepared, I believe we did well. This budget represents the Administration's commitment to the evolution of the Space Shuttle into an operational system. It also provides for continuing progress in major NASA programs.

The President is requesting just over $6.6 billion for NASA in fiscal year '83. This represents an overall increase of $673 million, or 11 percent, over the revised plan for fiscal year 1982. Factoring in inflation, we will have a slight increase in purchasing power throughout this fiscal year.

The $5.3 billion requested for research and development constitutes 81 percent, or the lion's share,

of the total request. More than half of this request, or $3.5 billion, is for Space Transportation, which includes not only the Shuttle, but also our stable of expendable launch vehicles.

The $3.5 billion would be divided about evenly bewteen Shuttle production, system upgrading and performance augmentation on the one hand, and Shuttle operations on the other.

This is in contrast to previous years when funds for the latter lagged significantly below the former. The budget request reflects rapid movement into the operational phase, which we expect to begin in early fiscal '83 with the first operational flight.

The Shuttle's two orbital test flights were highly successful and proved that the concept of this extremely sophisticated, versatile and reusable space vehicle is technically sound.

This budget is consistent with our immediate goal -- to make the Shuttle the work horse of our civil and military efforts in space through the '80s and into the '90s.

This budget will support a schedule of five planned launches including the first operational mission in FY '83, 10 launches in FY '84, and 13 launches in FY '85; continued progress in production of the third and

fourth Shuttle orbiters, 103 and 104 -- you will recall, the second orbiter, 099, is scheduled for delivery during FY '82;

Provision of upper stages for planetary, geosynchronous and other special missions; launch of the first Spacelab mission and continued procurement of the second Spacelab flight unit;

Performance augmentation to reduce the weight of the solid rocket boosters and enhance the Shuttle's ascent performance for future NASA and national security missions;

Preparation for a demonstration of the Shuttle's capability to retrieve an operational spacecraft -- the Solar Maximum Satellite -- for repair in orbit or return to Earth for refurbishment;

The test, checkout and initial operation of the new Data Relay Satellite System.

In addition to increased emphasis on the Shuttle's operational capability, the FY '83 budget will continue to support progress in aeronautical research and technology and in other vital areas of the space program.

Though some reductions have been made in the area of aeronautical research and technology, the FY '83 request of $232 million will provide for technology advances in all aeronautical disciplines, stressing those

which have been judged most vital in maintaining U.S. leadership in civil and military aviation.

The budget preserves a strong research and technology base in aerodynamics, propulsion, materials and structures, aircraft controls and guidance, and human factors.

It also maintains the experimental facilities and skilled personnel dedicated to this goal at the NASA research centers.

With Congressional approval, this budget will also support vital ongoing NASA programs. It proposes:

- $682 million for space science programs, emphasizing Spacelab missions; continued flight operations support anticipating Voyager's encounter with Uranus in 1986; developmental work on the Space Telescope, to be launched in 1985; on the Gamma Ray Observatory, to be launched in 1988; on the Galileo Jupiter Probe, to be launched in 1985; on the support systems and science instruments of the International Solar Polar Mission, a joint NASA-European Space Agency program; and on the physics and astronomy explorers and suborbital activities.

- $320 million for important work in space applications missions, including the analysis of early data from Landsat-D's Thematic Mapper, a new generation Earth-scanning instrument which greatly improves our

capability to study global resources; continued payload development projects for Spacelab, including materials processing; and analysis of early results from the International Search and Rescue Experiment, which will provide faster and more accurate data by satellite for locating aircraft or ships in distress.

The FY 1983 budget request also provides for continuing studies, investigations and definitions of mission options and advanced programs that will soon be possible because of the Shuttle's operational capability and flexibility.

Possibilities under study include unmanned platforms in both low Earth orbit and geosynchronous orbit; a permanently manned facility, or space station, in low Earth orbit, and various elements of orbital test and transportation for their support.

I have given you brief highlights of our proposed budget for FY '83. Like every other government agency, we have had to reduce or delay some programs because of the urgent need to cut the rate of increase in federal spending.

But because of the importance to the nation of NASA's work and its spinoffs, we have come off well. And though there are no new starts, we continuing with most of our ongoing activity in what we consider to be a

balanced way.

Looking to the future, I am confident we will make the most of the opportunities the Shuttle affords as we open a magnificent new era of transportation, commerce and industrialization in space.

Thank you very much. That concludes my prepared remarks, and we are prepared to take questions.

MR. DUFF: Are there any remarks from the table before we start the questions? We can go right to questions.

MR. DOOLING: Dave Dooling, the Huntsville Times. Mr. Beggs, what is going to be the upper stage for Galileo?

MR. BEGGS: The early plan is IUS.

MR. WALDROP: On that same topic, could you perhaps amplify why you decided not to go ahead with the Centaur development? Mitch Waldrop, Science.

MR. BEGGS: The discussions around that subject really revolved around the question of whether there were sufficient missions for the stage and, therefore, whether the amounts of money that were necessary in order to integrate and to develop the Centaur for Shuttle were warranted within a very limited mission envelope. And the decision was that there was not a sufficient number of missions for Centaur, and that the cost thereof would

not be be cost-effective.

MR. ROSSITER: Al Rossiter, UPI. I understand there is no money in the budget for long-lead items, for the fifth orbiter. Does that mean that NASA no longer has that option to proceed with the fifth orbiter?

MR. BEGGS: No. The decision on 105 was to go back and re-examine the necessity and the need for 105. There is no specific funding identified, but we are going to look hard, in the coming year, at the possibility of bringing 105 along, after 104, with the potential perhaps of doing what we have been urged to do a couple of times by the Congress, in looking at a block buy concept. But there is, at the present time, while no specific funds are available at the present time, there is a certain amount of planning going on, to look to the possibility of buying 105.

MR. ROSSITER: When you're talking about block buying, are you talking about more than one orbiter at a time?

MR. BEGGS: Well, the idea would be to write a contract which would include a couple of orbiters, yes, but as you know, 104 is currently on contract, and we would have to then look to rewriting that contract, or modifying the contract in such a way as to perhaps get a better deal, or a better arrangement, in order to allow

the manufacturer to do his planning in a more effective way.

MR. WALDROP: Mitch Waldrop, Science. Mr. Beggs, it's been said that if you don't make some effort to purchase 105 very shortly, like in six months, Rockwell's going to have to start shutting down production lines and it's going to be much more expensive to restart those.

What is your deadline, if you will, for making this decision?

MR. BEGGS: Well, our view is we have until late this year. I think I'd like to ask General Abrahamson to comment on that. He's been closest to this. As you know, Abe just took over the Office of Space Transportation Systems, and he's been working on that problem very hard.

GENERAL ABRAHAMSON: We are looking at our study to show the advantages of the block buy and any possible cost reductions that might be available either to 104, to 104 with 105, and to the spares complement. We are looking for that study to be complete by the June time frame.

Now, this is a very complex problem, to look at any of these kinds of block buy advantages. I did it on the F-16, and it took us over a year of study, but the initial studies did show that, in fact, there was an

advantage, at least for the F-16, and the key is at the subcontractor level.

So, we would hope that this initial study would give us a basis for any early allocation of funds, or to determine exactly what is the best schedule for a deliberate production rate by around the June time frame.

MR. COVAULT: Craig Covault, Aviation Week. Jim, to go back to the upper-stage question, does the answer to the earlier two questions mean, in effect, that the discussions between NASA and Air Force on maybe a smaller Centaur version have come to naught, or are you still talking?

MR. BEGGS: Well, put it this way, Craig, we haven't -- at this point, haven't written off the possibilities of Centaur and the Shuttle, it is just that in this budget, the question was, what is planned for Galileo in this budget, and it is IUS.

MR. COVAULT: But aside from this budget, it's still a possibility that you can fly Galileo on a smaller Centaur?

MR. BEGGS: Sure, there's always that possibility.

MR. EBERHART: Jon Eberhart, Science News. What's intended under this new budget plan, regarding the continued operations, data reduction, turning off of Pioneer 6 through 9, Pioneer 10 and 11, Pioneer Venus?

MR. BEGGS: I think I'll let Ed Smiley come up here and talk to that point, if I can find him. Wait a minute. On second thought, on mature consideration, we will let Andy Stofan reply.

MR. STOFAN: In our mission output, operations and data analysis budget in the planetary program, there is money included for the operation of Voyager for the Uranus encounter, and the beginning money going in for the Galileo.

Besides that, it appears that the budget is such that we will have to give serious consideration to not tracking the Pioneer spacecraft in the future.

MR. COVAULT: Is there a technically meaningful term that has something to do with turning them off, or is this a matter of stopping data reduction and running down links and whether you listen?

MR. STOFAN: Right now, the extent of how far we'll go is under study with the amount of money that we have. We are looking at more economical ways to track the Pioneers, perhaps picking out one or two of them that are returning the most useful data. But, at the present time, it looks like we're going to have to take some action, as a minimum, to curtail the activity.

The worst scenario would be that we would have to stop taking the scientific data and analyzing it, but

we would most likely continue -- Ed Smiley would continue to actually track the spacecraft.

MR. COVAULT: Craig Covault, again. In the aero program, Jim, it looks like you lost about five areas and about $35 million worth of work, compared to fiscal '82.

Can you tell me what the basic original request for aeronautics was compared to what you got, and why the areas were cut that were cut?

MR. BEGGS: Well, let me address the latter part of your question first. The cuts were primarily in the areas where we made the decision that demonstration programs, or programs which were primarily directed towards demonstration, could be assumed by the industry.

In short, it was a decision based on a policy decision to encourage the industry to take over that part of the work which was basically hardware, or which was leading to hardware.

And as a result, some of the systems work and some demonstration work was either curtailed or run out, and we anticipated no additional work in those areas. That was kind of the philosophy.

The amounts that were originally put in were in the order of $370 million. Does that answer the question?

MR. WALDROP: Mitch Waldrop, Science. I have a quick question about the Solar Polar Mission. The new money in this budget, is that going to a new American spacecraft, or just the operations of the European spacecraft?

MR. BEGGS: In ISPM?

MR. WALDROP: Yes.

MR. BEGGS: Just the European spacecraft. There was the addition of a kick stage to that total, which was additional money, but that was necessary in order to accomplish the mission.

MR. WALDROP: Within the research and analysis budget, one of the major effects, I understand, is that you are going to shut down the infrared telescope facility in Hawaii, which is a brand new telescope.

Could you amplify on the reasoning behind that, please?

MR. BEGGS: It's not our intent -- it is true that the amounts in the runout assume that NASA will not be funding that facility, but the assumption is that it will be picked up by NSF.

MR. WALDROP: Do you have any indication that will be the case?

MR. BEGGS: Well, I guess I have not talked directly to anyone over there, but my understanding is,

yes, that they will pick it up.

MR. DOOLING: Dave Dooling, the Huntsville Times. What impact do you expect that cutbacks in aeronautics research and death of the technology transfer program will have on the President's plan for economic recovery?

MR. BEGGS: Ha.

(Laughter.)

MR. BEGGS: That's a little bit like the one, when did I stop beating my wife? Just last night.

(Laughter.)

MR. BEGGS: We still have a program in technology transfer and utilization, and I believe that that will continue. It is true that we've cut back on the amounts in those programs but, you know, a lot of the transfer and tech utilization activities that have taken place in the past have resulted from the folks who are interested in that technology spending the time and the effort and the money to come into the NASA centers and get it for themselves. We expect that to continue.

It is also anticipated that if the users of this particular function really want it, that they will pay for it. And I guess there is an assumption that there would be a user charge or a user arrangement set up, but my view is that we will be able to handle this within the budget.

It's like everything else, you'd like to do more, but within the budget levels we had, we came out where we came out, and there still will be an office at each one of the centers, and the information will still be available, and we still intend to continue much of the effort in encouraging the industry to come in and listen to us and join with us in joint meetings where we can pass this on to them.

MR. COVAULT: Craig Covault. Probably more appropriate for Tom Newman. Could you list new starts you requested but failed to get, the larger ones, and also the initial budget request figure for the whole agency, compared to the 6.6 or so that you got?

MR. BEGGS: We'll let Tom wrestle with that.

MR. NEWMAN: I assume your question means the original request to OMB in September. Is that what you're asking?

MR. COVAULT: Yes, I guess that's the most appropriate.

MR. NEWMAN: We requested $7 billion, I believe it was -- it was about $7.6 billion to OMB. The major items that we requested in that larger figure that were not included in the budget that's before you -- well, we had funding in there planned at that time, for the fifth orbiter, and that was deleted.

We had proposed to initiate the 20-30 gigahertz communications satellites, and that funding was deleted. We had a mission that was not a new start, but would have been in '82, the VOIR, and that was deleted to the budget following from that.

There were a number of systems technology activities in aeronautics, such as the next phase of the advanced turboprop on large composite structures -- I'm trying to think of some more -- there were several in aeronautics that were deleted. I believe those were the new initiatives.

MS. FREEMAN: Marsha Freeman, Fusion Magazine. There has been a lot of concern leading up to today, I guess, of the manpower or possible layoff situations at a number of NASA labs, particularly JPL and Lewis Lab.

How does this funding level for '83 affect that? In other words, do you expect to still have to have a lot of people let go?

MR. BEGGS: I think I'll let Dr. Mark respond to that. By now, you know how this works -- I answer the easy ones and they answer the hard ones.

DR. MARK: We expect to come down in the next two years, a total of about 600 -- somewhat over 650 equivalent manyears -- that's full-time equivalent -- 220 will be fiscal year '82, and 400-and-some will be in

fiscal '83.

Incidentally, that will not require reductions-in-force. That is, one could take that by attrition, but I should point out that we may, in certain installations, do a reduction-in-force, use the reduction-in-force procedures to preserve certain skill mixes that we think are important.

In other words, if you let this go by attrition, which we could do, then you would lose people that you would want to keep, and so we may have to run reductions-in-forces.

There are no plans to close any installations, as somebody implied, and with respect to JPL, we are working hard to encourage the laboratory to take on missions that are appropriate to the skills there and space operations by other federal agencies.

MR. BEGGS: Those numbers, incidentally, specific numbers, are on page 8 of your handout.

MR. PAYNE: Just a quick followup on what Dr. Mark said on finding other work for JPL? Do you mean military work?

DR. MARK: Could be.

MR. PAYNE: Moving on to tracking and data acquisitions in that sector, is this first outlay on the TDRSS? Does that -- could you tell me what the $61 million

is, and is that the start of the payment to Western Union on the use of that?

MR. BEGGS: Yes, it is.

MR. PAYNE: When is it going operational?

MR. BEGGS: To Spacecom, the consortium that is there, but it is the start of those payments.

MR. PAYNE: It is the start of your lease on that?

MR. BEGGS: Yes.

MR. ROSSITER: Al Rossiter, UPI. The agency has been seeking funds for several years for VOIR, unsuccessfully. Do you expect to continue to request money next year, for instance, for VOIR, or is the project pretty well dead?

MR. BEGGS: Let me respond briefly, and then I will let Hans add to it. The budget that you have before you, and the runouts thereof, assume a runout of the current series of programs -- that is, the budget that's there for '83 is run out assuming no new starts, which is a little bit different than what it has been in past years.

In past years, there was a new start planning wedge put in, and that's not there now, but it was done -- those decisions were made on the basis that the budget does not prejudice our coming in and discussing new starts

in the future.

Whether VOIR or something else would be our choice for that, I think, depends on where our planning goes from here. But it is not intended -- that is, the budget figures are not intended to preclude any specific area, such as VOIR. Do you want to add to that?

DR. MARK: Yes, let me add a little bit to that. The VOIR mission was a rather big project, assuming an orbiting vehicle with a synthetic aperture radar for the collection of images, and priced out in the half-billion dollar range.

What we have asked the scientific community to do, and they have responded very well to this and, as a matter of fact, some of them have taken the initiative to push us in that direction, is to look at a less expensive way to do similar things.

Just the other day, I had a very interesting session with some people who are proposing to do the same work, the same job on a VOIR with a real aperture radar system, which is much less expensive because it doesn't require the high data rate that a synthetic aperture does, where one can do substantially the same thing for roughly $200 million.

So, one of the things that the constrained budget does is that it forces people to think of perhaps better

and less expensive ways to do the same job, and the general idea is that we have two committees now studying ways to do planetary missions for less money -- one under Noel Hinners and the other one under Gene Levy, I guess, and we expect them both to come up with new ideas.

MS. HOYT: Diana Hoyt, office of Congressman Dan Akaka. I'd like to get back just for one moment to the question of the IRTF facility on Mauna Kea. Is it true, in fact, that NASA's decision to eliminate funding for this facility reflects a larger policy decision in that NASA has concurred with the Administration's suggestion that NASA no longer continue to fund operating costs for groundbased facilities?

MR. BEGGS: No, I wouldn't draw that conclusion.

MR. BEATTY: Kelly Beatty, from Sky and Telescope. Dr. Mark, the ongoing policy assessment, through the Office of Science and Technology Policy, headed by Vic Reese, I have been told that that committee, that policy review committee, has been intimately involved in the crafting of the fiscal '83 budget, and perhaps you could tell us the specific areas in which they have an input on what we see before us today?

DR. MARK: The committee that is establishing new policies in several areas has not, in fact, been involved in the crafting of the fiscal '83 budget, as you

put it.

People in Dr. Keyworth's office, of course, have been involved because -- as members of the White House staff, but it is important to recognize that those two activities are quite separate.

In terms of the involvement of Dr. Keyworth, he has provided, as his job requires by statute, advice to the President on matters of science and technology, and he has done so in the case of our budget.

MR. DOOLING: Dave Dooling, Huntsville Times. There is a healthy increase in there for the advance program planning. Does this indicate some intense study work in fiscal '83, following definition of the permanent presence in space this summer?

MR. BEGGS: A short answer is, yes, it does anticipate that.

MR. JOYCE: Chris Joyce, New Science Magazine. Have you made a decision on whether to go ahead with the Solar Max Rescue using the Shuttle and, if so, when, and how much will it cost?

MR. BEGGS: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

MR. JOYCE: The rescue of the Solar Maximum Mission. Have you decided --

MR. BEGGS: Yes, from our part, we have made a decision that we would like to run that mission. Now,

in order to get it started, we would have to spend some money in fiscal year '82, and to do that, we will have to request of our congressional committees the right to reprogram some money. That has not yet been accomplished.

MR. JOYCE: Anything from OMB on that? Have they given their approval on that?

MR. BEGGS: Yes. The answer is, yes.

MR.BENEDICT: Howard Benedict,AP. Mr. Beggs, you've talked often, you've said often that a space operation center should be a major goal of this country and of NASA.

Has President Reagan or Dr. Keyworth, or anyone in the White House, given you any encouragement that the President might support such a project sometime in the future?

MR. BEGGS: We have been given enough encouragement that we have proceeded with a study to look carefully at that. Like everything else in a program of that magnitude and a decision of that size, no one is going to agree beforehand that they will give us a blank check to do that kind program because they don't know what it's going to look like until actually we put together a plan for them, and we are in the process of putting a plan together.

MS. REALES: Patty Reales, Satellite Week.

Given the fact that the Chinese are planning on launching a 30-20 gigahertz satellite system in the future, either summer or before, what is the progress of our own -- and that there's no money here for the 30-20 gigahertz program, where does it all stand for the future?

MR. BEGGS: There is money for the technology, the black box development and the basic push on the technology end of the 30-20 range will continue. The thing that was eliminated was the flying of a satellite.

And, again, the philosophy or the policy behind that is that once that technology is developed and is presented to the industry, if the industry wants to proceed toward the implementation of a satellite, they should come in and make a proposal to us, or to the government, and pay for it.

MR. SILVERSTONE: Ken Silverstone, Defense Daily. How close are you to coming to finalize a design for either the manned Space Station or the unmanned platform, and is there any plan to go ahead with the unmanned system first, and could you go ahead as soon as '84?

MR. BEGGS: Phil, do you want to talk to that? Phil Culbertson, who has been heading this study.

MR. CULBERTSON: As you know, we've been studying both the manned and the unmanned concepts for an awful long time. We are taking the position that we could

start in '84, if the decision were made that we wanted to move ahead that rapidly.

As to the question, is it going to be manned or unmanned at the beginning, that decision has not been made. We are looking very carefully at both concepts.

QUESTION: Dr. Mark, I'm afraid I must press. This is the second conference I've been to today, with no OSTP representative.

If Dr. Keyworth was, in fact, intimately involved in your budget-setting process, what were the specific areas in which he had input?

DR. MARK: Well, Dr. Keyworth, for example, was present at the meetings that we had with senior members of the White House staff in the final budget deliberations, and if I remember correctly, he participated actively in the discussions both on the subject of aeronautics and on the subject of space science.

MR. DAVID: Leonard David, with the National Space Institute. Listening to your remarks at the beginning, Mr. Beggs, should NASA acquire more projects with national security implications, to ensure itself larger budgets in the future?

MR. BEGGS: That's not our job. It has been our job, for NASA and its predecessor agencies in the last 60-odd years, to support the military, and we've done

that in a very effective way, I believe, and it has, I think, been a very productive and profitable partnership, since much of the technology that we do is of use to the DOD in opening up new concepts and new ideas for the use of aeronautics in space, and for the pursuit of whatever technology they need to solve problems.

I personally believe, and this is my strong belief from my experience on both sides of the table, both in industry and in government, that a program that we have conducted, which is largely in the open and largely pursuing a broad range of technology, serves both the DOD and the nation best.

I'll give you one example. Just before I left the General Dynamics Company, we were putting a new wing on the F-16. It was a double-Delta, or what NASA people like to refer to as a cranked arrow wing design.

That wing came out of the SST, Supersonic Transport program. It just happened that the first application was on a military aircraft. And I think that kind of thing is very important because, when you do advance technology, advance research, you don't know where the applications are going to come.

So, I would be, again, going after specific mission-oriented or even specifically directly related kinds of research and technology to defense kinds of

applications and opt for the more broader based program that we've conducted for many, many years.

MR. WASHBURN: Mark Washburn, freelance. The Halley's Commet Mission has already gone by the boards, of course, but is there any money in the budget for some American response to this visitation in 1986, perhaps in support of European or Japanese efforts?

MR. BEGGS: We do have money in here for the Halley's watch activity, and we will be gathering the data, and that program remains in our plans.

DR. MARK: Let me add just one point to that. There are, in the plans, I think, two Shuttle flights which will have instuments on them to look at Halley's Comet from above the atmosphere, and we expect those instruments to yield quite unique data.

MR. WALDROP: It's become clear to all of us that over the last several years, and especially this last year, that planetary science gone in, shall we call it retrenchment?

One of the rationales for that was that, well, we've been to all the planets now, all the major planets; let's look at the data we already have. Now we see that the research and analysis budget has been cut back very drastically, for examining this data, and I wonder if you would care to comment on that? Mitch Waldrop, Science

Magazine.

MR. BEGGS: Well, we have, as you say, done an awful lot in the last ten years. There is no intent on the part of this budget, to stop the activities. we've tried to fit them in as best we can, into this budget.

I think what you see reflected there is perhaps some reduction in what has gone before, but as Dr. Mark responded to an earlier question, there is no intent to stop the planetary work. The intent, with this budget, was to put the community on notice that we would like them to restudy the future and, if possible, tell us how to do future missions and future analysis and future research in a different and perhaps less expensive way.

MR. BEATTY: Kelly Beatty. Mr. Beggs, if you've gotten enough encouragement from the White House to proceed with the detailed study of the SOC, have you also received enough encouragement to proceed with detailed studies of transferring the operation of the Shuttle program to a non-NASA agency?

MR. BEGGS: Well, that's something that has been, I guess if not encouraged, at least given consideration for a long, long time. This agency, as you know, has never been a major operating agency and, as we move into the operational phase of Shuttle, it is a major operational responsibility, and the agency has looked at

that in the past and will continue to look at it in the future, as to whether there are ways of passing the responsibility off to someone else, either another government, or a quasi-government, or a private sector kind of operator.

I don't think, at this time, there is -- I can't say there is any encouragement. There is no discouragement of that idea that's come out of the White House. The various and sundry proposals that I've read about are very sketchy in their outlines, and I guess my feeling is we've got to get a lot firmer and do a lot more detailed work to find out how that would happen.

MR. EBERHART: Jon Eberhart, Science News. You've spoken a little about the reduction in research and analysis funding. Is there any -- part of the research and analysis funding, in the case of Jupiter, for instance, has come out of the project's own funds, the Jupiter data analysis program, I gather, is a part of the Voyager project itself, an augmentation to that rather than something in the standard research and analysis line item.

Is there any augmentation of that provision at all, for the study of the Saturn data, in the Voyager budget?

MR. BEGGS: Andy, do you want to -- you don't

want to. The answer is, no.

MR. DIXON: David Dixon. A question about the ISPM mission. Has there been any attempt within the budget to cushion the impact of last year's cut of the American spacecraft to the mission, or do you believe it is essentially the Europeans' responsibility to pick up the pieces and put a valid mission together?

MR. BEGGS: I'm not sure I understand completely the basis of the question. As you know, our decision was to eliminate the American spacecraft, but we did agree, and continue to fund, the cooperative effort that we've had in that program.

We're providing instruments, technical support, the launch vehicle, and whatever that our European colleagues desire.

MR. DIXON: But I was wondering whether there was any extra instrumentation on any extra facility within the budget that might not have been there according to the original plans, but had been put there to cushion the cuts.

MR. BEGGS: No, there is not.

MR. SILVERSTONE: Ken Silverstone. You have $60 million in the budget for Shuttle thrust augmentation. Is this money for the new case for the solid rocket motor? Will that give you -- how much added payload will that

give you and will that be sufficient, or will you need something else?

MR. BEGGS: The answer is, yes, it is for that, and let me let Gen. Abrahamson respond to that in detail.

GENERAL ABRAHAMSON: It is for the filament wound case which, of course, is a lighter propellant system for the SRB, and we expect about 5500 pounds if we are successful at all in that development effort of augmentation.

MR. SILVERSTONE: Would there be some additional augmentation required, like operating the engines, the main engines. Is that still being considered, or will that be considered later?

GENERAL ABRAHAMSON: Well, we are now in the process of certifying the main engines to the 109 percent level, and that is going in a very, very successful manner.

MR. SILVERSTONE: Let me just ask about one other subject. There's been quite a few studies about a derivative vehicle for the Space Shuttle. Is that a strong possibility, would you say, at this point, that we will be going to that sometime in the future, or is that just another step?

MR. BEGGS: Derivative, in the sense of a new or second generation vehicle?

MR. SILVERSTONE: An unmanned vehicle, using

the components.

MR. BEGGS: Oh. There are continuing studies on a possible expendable or unmanned use of the Shuttle's engines, yes, but I can't outline any specific program at the present time.

MS. FREEMAN: Marsha Freeman, from Fusion. In hearings over that last few months, especially on the House side, Dr. Keyworth actually has indicated that he didn't think there was actually enough money in the budget to do various things, including Galileo, and likewise, of course, Mr. Stockman made a number of statements from the time he came into OMB, on cutting the NASA very severely.

Although you really don't have new starts and many of the things that are necessary, you certainly have come out with an increase, and a significant one. What would you contribute your success to?

(Laughter.)

MR. BEGGS: Talent.

(Laughter and applause.)

MS. FREEMAN: I'm not familiar with the way NASA's mail runs, but I imagine that there must have been a great deal of public support for the program. Did that help you in some visible way?

MR. BEGGS: There has been an enormous amount of both public and private support, and it has, I think,

been gratifying for everyone in the agency, to see the degree that this program is appreciated, not only among our more closely related constituencies but in the general public, at large.

There have been lots of letters from private citizens. There have been lots of inputs made, and it's a very heartwarming and gratifying response, and we are very pleased with it.

MR. BENSON: Johan Benson, Astronautics and Aeronautics Magazine. Admiral Inman, Deputy Director of the CIA, has stated that there has been a massive hemorrhaging of U.S. technology to the Soviet Union, and this has contributed markedly to the development of Soviet military technology in the last decade.

Will there be any measures taken by NASA, to control the release of NASA developed technology to other countries?

MR. BEGGS: Beyond what we have done in the past, we are not anticipating any large new efforts to change our publications policy, or any of that sort. We are, I think, as I think everyone should be, duly concerned about the release of information that comes out of this agency that may help the Soviets in their military endeavors, and we do try, as best we can, to limit anything that might have that kind of application,

but this is, as you all know, it's been an open agency in the past, and it's our intent to keep it an open agency.

That does run you the risk that, occasionally, a piece of technology which you would like to see developed in the United States, as a first endeavor, does get developed first abroad, including some of our friendly competitors. And I think that's inevitable, but I think the benefits, overall, to American industry and to the economy at large, by keeping an open program, far outweigh that.

MR. EBERHART: What's the range of possible futures under this budget plan, and what you expect to follow for the lunar curatorial facility? The second question is, I understand that Congress appropriated $10 million for VOIR in fiscal '82, and there isn't VOIR in fiscal '83. What happened to that $10 million, and did Congress have a say in it?

MR. BEGGS: We have submitted to the Congress an '82 operating plan which, essentially, is in consonance with the '83 decisions. The Congress, in its wisdom, will do what it will do with that budget. I would expect that we will be in detailed discussions with them starting next week, as to the decisions that have been made with respect to this budget, and we will see where

that comes out, but we have this budget, as a point of departure and as the decision, the policy and the decisions that have been made relative to that program, and I will defend it. That's the way it will be.

MR. EBERHART: And the lunar curatorial facility?

MR. BEGGS: Who wants to take that? Andy?

MR. STOFAN: That was funded under the AR and DA and the Planetary program. And due to the constraints placed upon that budget line item, we will either greatly curtail the activities, or perhaps mothball the facility for a year, and come back in the future and look for an enhancement to keep that program going.

I think the data analysis and sample analysis that will be out will be continued, but the facility may have to be mothballed for a year.

MR. DUFF: For those of you who came in late, the White House has asked us to announce that the embargo on material for all agencies has been lifted, and that is, of course, true of the material you got here today. The 12:00 noon, Monday, embargo has been lifted by the White House.

This conference was monitored by the centers audio only, for those of you who are here from out of town. Any last remarks?

MR. BEGGS: No, I think not, unless either of my colleagues has something to say. We thank you very much, we've enjoyed it.

(Whereupon, at 4:00 p.m., the press briefing with James M. Beggs, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was concluded.)

NASA News

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Washington, D.C. 20546
AC 202 755-8370

For Release:

UPON RELEASE OF PRESIDENT'S
BUDGET MESSAGE, 12:00 NOON
FEBRUARY 8, 1982

BACKGROUND MATERIAL

NASA FY 1983 BUDGET BRIEFING

HOLD FOR RELEASE AT 12:00 NOON, EST, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1982

NOTE: This statement relates to the Fiscal Year 1983 Budget and is subject to the same conditions. There should be no premature release of this statement nor should any of its contents be paraphrased or alluded to in earlier stories. There is a total embargo on the Budget until 12:00 Noon, EST, February 8, 1982, which includes any and all references to any material in the Budget Appendix, or support statements.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

BUDGET SUMMARY
(Thousands of Dollars)

BUDGET PLAN	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
Research and development.....	4,334,338	4,738,000	5,334,000
Construction of facilities.....	116,950	98,700	100,000
Research and program management....	1,071,064	1,144,700[a/]	1,178,900
TOTAL BUDGET PLAN.....	5,522,352	5,981,400	6,612,900
OUTLAYS.....	5,425,557	5,831,000	6,582,000

a/ Includes increased requirement of $41.4 million to cover revised salary rates effective in FY 1982.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

BUDCET PLAN
(Thousands of Dollars)

Cognizant Office and Program	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS/OPERATIONS	2,728,600	3,090,100	3,467,800
Space Shuttle	1,995,000	2,163,000	1,718,000
Space flight operations	679,200	895,900	1,707,000
Expendable launch vehicles	54,400	31,200	42,800
SPACE SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS	881,838	901,800	1,002,300
Physics and astronomy	323,700	323,500	471,700
Planetary exploration	175,600	205,000	154,600
Life sciences	42,188	39,500	55,700
Space applications	331,550	325,800	316,300
Technology utilization	8,800	8,000	4,000
AERONAUTICS AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY	384,000	344,000	355,000
Aeronautics research and technology	271,400	233,000	232,000
Space research and technology	110,700	111,000	123,000
Energy technology	1,900	---	---
SPACE TRACKING AND DATA SYSTEMS	339,900	402,100	508,900
TOTAL	4,334,338	4,738,000	5,334,000

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SPACE TRANSPORTATION

BUDGET PLAN
(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
SPACE SHUTTLE	1,995,000	2,163,000	1,718,000
DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION..	(973,000)	(898,000)	(---)
Orbiter	510,500	422,000	---
Main engine	134,000	130,000	---
External tanks	63,500	56,000	---
Solid rocket boosters	50,500	30,000	---
Launch and landing	214,500	260,000	---
PRODUCTION	(1,022,000)	(1,260,000)	(1,585,500)
Orbiter	779,000	860,000	933,500
Main engine	112,000	144,000	262,000
Launch and landing	33,000	63,000	67,000
Spares and equipment	98,000	193,000	323,000
CHANGES/SYSTEMS UPGRADING	(---)	(---)	(72,500)
PERFORMANCE AUGMENTATION	(---)	(5,000)	(60,000)
SPACE FLIGHT OPERATIONS	679,200	895,900	1,707,000
SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OPERATIONS CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	(81,700)	(79,300)	(85,400)
Space transportation system upper stages	38,300	23,200	32,000
All other	43,400	56,100	53,400
DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND MISSION SUPPORT/ ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY BASE	(183,500)	(184,000)	(82,400)
ADVANCED PROGRAMS	(11,800)	(8,800)	(11,900)
SPACELAB	(138,800)	(100,800)	(113,200)
SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OPERATIONS	(263,400)	(523,000)	(1,414,100)
EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES	54,400	31,200	42,800
Scout	900	800	---
Centaur	5,600	---	---
Delta	47,900	30,400	42,800
TOTAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION	2,728,600	3,090,100	3,467,800

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SPACE SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS

BUDGET PLAN
(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY	323,700	323,500	471,700
Space Telescope	119,300	121,500	137,500
International solar polar mission development	28,000	5,000	21,000
Gamma ray observatory development	8,200	8,000	34,500
Shuttle/Spacelab payload development and mission management	27,400	40,000	81,400
Explorer development	33,300	33,300	34,300
Mission operations and data analysis	38,900	50,000	85,600
Research and analysis	37,700	32,900	39,200
Suborbital programs	30,900	32,800	38,200
PLANETARY EXPLORATION	175,600	205,000	154,600
Galileo development	63,100	120,000	92,600
Mission operations and data analysis	61,800	38,300	26,500
Research and analysis	50,700	46,700	35,500
LIFE SCIENCES	42,188	39,500	55,700
Life sciences flight experiments	12,700	14,000	24,000
Research and analysis	29,488	25,500	31,700
SPACE APPLICATIONS	331,550	325,800	316,300
RESOURCE OBSERVATIONS	(151,350)	(146,400)	(132,200)
Landsat-D	88,500	83,900	61,700
Shuttle/Spacelab payload development	2,000	3,300	2,800
Geodynamics	23,400	22,900	26,200
AgRISTARS	21,450	14,000	15,000
Applied research and data analysis and related activities	16,000	22,300	26,500
ENVIRONMENTAL OBSERVATIONS	(104,100)	(116,500)	(128,900)
Applied research and data analysis and related activities	76,800	77,400	87,200
Shuttle/Spacelab payload development	1,700	4,100	3,700
Earth radiation budget experiment	20,300	24,000	24,000
Upper atmospheric research satellite experiments and mission definition	---	6,000	14,000
Halogen occultation experiment	4,500	5,000	---
National oceanic satellite system (NOSS)	800	---	---

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SPACE SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS (Continued)

BUDGET PLAN
(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
SPACE APPLICATIONS (Continued)			
APPLICATIONS SYSTEMS	(18,100)	(13,200)	(11,700)
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	(8,100)	(5,000)	(---)
MATERIALS PROCESSING IN SPACE	(18,700)	(23,800)	(23,600)
Applied research and data analysis	10,543	15,000	20,300
Shuttle/Spacelab payload development	8,157	8,800	3,300
COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS	(31,200)	(20,900)	(19,900)
Applied research and data analysis and related activities	26,400	18,600	16,200
Search and rescue	4,800	2,300	3,700
TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION PROGRAM	8,800	8,000	4,000
TOTAL SPACE SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS	881,838	901,800	1,002,300

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

AERONAUTICS AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY

BUDGET PLAN
(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY	271,400	233,000	232,000
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY BASE	(133,847)	(162,500)	(182,000)
SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS	(137,553)	(70,500)	(50,000)
Aeronautical systems studies	3,125	---	---
Materials and structures systems technology	8,715	6,600	---
Propulsion systems technology	4,400	500	---
Avionics and flight control systems technology	1,200	1,300	---
General aviation systems technology	1,045	---	---
Low speed aircraft systems technology	23,511	25,600	30,000
High speed aircraft systems technology	16,615	7,700	20,000
Transport aircraft systems technology	32,746	13,400	---
Advanced propulsion systems technology	46,196	15,400	---
SPACE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY	110,700	111,000	123,000
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY BASE	(100,380)	(105,200)	(115,600)
SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS	(8,220)	(2,800)	(4,400)
Space systems studies	2,083	---	---
Information systems technology	4,062	---	---
Spacecraft systems technology	2,075	2,800	4,400
STANDARDS AND PRACTICES	(2,100)	(3,000)	(3,000)
ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	1,900	---	---
TOTAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY	384,000	344,000	355,000

SPACE TRACKING AND DATA SYSTEMS

TRACKING AND DATA ACQUISITION	339,900	402,100	508,900
Operations	266,495	300,500	338,200
Systems implementation	62,105	89,100	96,000
Advanced systems	11,300	12,500	13,400
Tracking and data relay satellite system	---	---	61,300
TOTAL SPACE TRACKING AND DATA SYSTEMS	339,900	402,100	508,900

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

FISCAL YEAR 1983 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES PROGRAM

BUDGET PLAN
(Thousands of Dollars)

PROJECTS BY INSTALLATION

Goddard Space Flight Center	2,840
Rehabilitation and modification of utility systems	2,840
Langley Research Center	16,200
Modifications to the 4-by-7 meter low speed tunnel (1212-C)	7,200
Modifications to upgrade the transonic dynamics tunnel (648)	9,000
Lewis Research Center	3,915
Modification of rocket engine test facility for altitude testing	995
Modification to 450 PSI air system in engine research building	2,920
Wallops Flight Center	2,150
Rehabilitation of airfield	2,150
Dryden Flight Research Facility	4,500
Construction of data analysis facility	4,500
Space Shuttle Facilities at Various Locations as Follows:	21,405
Modification to solid rocket booster refurbishment and subassembly facilities (KSC)	1,700
Modification of manufacturing and final assembly facilities for external tanks (MAF)	17,845
Minor shuttle-unique projects (various locations)	1,860
Space Shuttle Payload Facilities at Various Locations as Follows:	1,740
Rehabilitation and modification for payload ground support operations (KSC)	1,740
Repair of Facilities at Various Locations, Not in Excess of $500,000 per Project	15,000
Rehabilitation and Modification of Facilities at Various Locations, Not in Excess of $500,000 per Project	20,000
Minor Construction of New Facilities and Additions to Existing Facilities at Various Locations, Not in Excess of $250,000 per Project	4,000
Facility Planning and Design	8,250
TOTAL	100,000

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

BUDGET PLAN
(Thousands of Dollars)

INSTALLATION	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
Johnson Space Center	176,051	186,635	192,396
Kennedy Space Center	150,200	163,441	169,500
Marshall Space Flight Center	164,985	170,840	177,704
National Space Technology Laboratories	5,506	6,086	6,252
Goddard Space Flight Center	162,448	170,066	173,638
Ames Research Center	94,843	102,689	104,893
Langley Research Center	120,776	127,951	131,303
Lewis Research Center	99,886	106,960	110,591
NASA Headquarters	96,369	110,032	112,623
TOTAL	1,071,064	1,144,700[a/]	1,178,900

a/ Includes increased requirement of $41.4 million to cover revised salary rates effective in FY 1982.

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERMANENT POSITIONS - END OF YEAR

Johnson Space Center	3,380	3,346	3,293
Kennedy Space Center	2,155	2,133	2,112
Marshall Space Flight Center	3,385	3,351	3,285
National Space Technology Laboratories	105	104	104
Goddard Space Flight Center	3,699	3,661	3,623
Ames Research Center	2,058	2,037	2,021
Langley Research Center	2,895	2,866	2,845
Lewis Research Center	2,690	2,663	2,479
NASA Headquarters	1,506	1,491	1,457
TOTAL	21,873	21,652	21,219